



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,502	12/19/2000	Barry Boone	2043.012US1	4828
49845	7590	01/04/2008	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/EBAY P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			BOYCE, ANDRE D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3623		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/04/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@SLWIP.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/740,502	BOONE, BARRY
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andre Boyce	3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 95-119 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 95-119 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/24/07.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 24, 2007 has been entered.
2. Claims 95, 102, 108 and 114 have been amended. Claims 95-119 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 95-105 and 107-118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Feedback Forum (eBay.com, November 10, 1999, via web.archive.org), in view of Fuerst (USPN 6,189,029).

As per claim 95, the Feedback Forum discloses a method, comprising: presenting predefined feedback comments (i.e., the user leaving the comment is asked whether the comment is positive, negative, or neutral, and selects one of these three (3) predefined terms, see "Leave Feedback about an eBay User") using an Internet connection to a first user in response to an online payment transaction

between the first user and a second user (i.e., a first user leaving feedback about a second user, via a comment relating to a buy or sell transaction with the second user, pages 1 and 2) and at the request of the first user (i.e., user decides to leave feedback concerning the transaction, page 1 and 2) and wherein the predefined feedback comments are presented in a feedback forum (i.e., Feedback Forum of eBay.com, page 1); and receiving a selection for one of the predefined feedback comments from the first user (i.e., the user leaving the comment is asked whether the comment is positive, negative, or neutral, and selects one of these three (3) predefined terms, see "Leave Feedback about an eBay User"), wherein the selection represents feedback that the first user is supplying and that is to be associated with the second user with respect to the online payment transaction (i.e., a user, either a seller or buyer, leaving feedback about a specific transaction, page 1).

The Feedback Forum does not explicitly disclose retaining an association of the first user, the online payment transaction, the selection, and the second user. Fuerst discloses assigning each group (or individual) a group identification (column 5, lines 23-25), a survey tool that assigns each question a unique question identification number, QID (column 5, lines 38-40), wherein the results, together with the group (or individual) identification, and the QID are stored in table 600 (column 7, lines 46-48). Both the Feedback Forum and Fuerst are concerned with collecting feedback from users in an on-line environment, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include retaining an association of the first user, the online payment transaction, the selection, and the

second user in the Feedback Forum, as seen in Fuerst, thereby being able to efficiently access the results and apply statistical tools or other applications to determine the tabulated results (see Fuerst, column 2, lines 43-47), thus making the Feedback Forum more robust.

As per claim 96, the Feedback Forum discloses receiving a free-form comment from the first user to be associated with the selection and retained with the association (i.e., positive, neutral, or negative comments from a user, page 1).

As per claim 97, the Feedback Forum does not explicitly disclose removing the free-form comment from the association and prevent the free-form comment from being retained when the free-form comment is determined to be against a policy. Fuerst discloses survey results submitted by users stored in table 600 (column 5, lines 66-67), wherein unnecessary tables may be deleted (column 6, lines 12-13). Both the Feedback Forum and Fuerst are concerned with collecting feedback from users in an on-line environment, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include removing the free-form comment from the association and prevent the free-form comment from being retained when the free-form comment is determined to be against a policy in the Feedback Forum, as seen in Fuerst, thereby being able to effectively control the feedback submitted by users, thus making the Feedback Forum more robust.

As per claim 98, the Feedback Forum discloses keeping a first identifier for the first user, and a second identifier for the second user (i.e., user ID, page 1). The Feedback Forum does not explicitly disclose a transaction number for the online

payment transaction, and a feedback identifier for the selection as an entry in a table associated with the second user. Fuerst discloses assigning each group (or individual) a group identification (column 5, lines 23-25), a survey tool that assigns each question a unique question identification number, QID (column 5, lines 38-40), wherein the results, together with the group (or individual) identification, and the QID are stored in table 600 (column 7, lines 46-48). Both the Feedback Forum and Fuerst are concerned with collecting feedback from users in an on-line environment, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a transaction number for the online payment transaction, and a feedback identifier for the selection as an entry in a table associated with the second user in the Feedback Forum, as seen in Fuerst, thereby being able to efficiently access the results and apply statistical tools or other applications to data mine the tabulated results (see Fuerst, column 2, lines 43-47), thus making the Feedback Forum more robust.

As per claim 99, the Feedback Forum discloses providing the selection to a requestor associated with a different online payment transaction (i.e., requestor is able to see feedback associated with any user ID, page 1).

As per claim 100, the Feedback Forum discloses receiving and retaining with the association a response comment from the second user that the second user supplies in response to the selection made by the first user with respect to the second user (i.e., a user reviewing and responding to comments left by other members about the user, page 2).

As per claim 101, the Feedback Forum discloses presenting the selection within an online auction facility when an identifier associated with the second user is presented (i.e., ID of the user, page 1).

As per claim 102, the Feedback Forum discloses a method, comprising: providing predefined feedback comments (i.e., the user leaving the comment is asked whether the comment is positive, negative, or neutral, and selects one of these three (3) predefined terms, see "Leave Feedback about an eBay User") using an Internet connection to users of an online payment transaction facility (i.e., a first user leaving feedback about a second user, via a comment relating to a buy or sell transaction with the second user, pages 1 and 2) within a feedback forum and at the request of the users (i.e., user decides to leave feedback concerning the transaction in Feedback Forum on eBay.com, page 1 and 2); and retaining selections made from the predefined feedback comments by users, wherein each selection is related to a specific first user that is a buyer, a specific second user that is a seller (i.e., retaining feedback by both the buyer and seller of a transaction, page 1), and a specific transaction associated that the specific first user and the specific second user engaged in with one another (i.e., comments left by the winning high bidder and seller in an auction, page 1).

The Feedback Forum does not explicitly disclose determining when selections can include free-form comments from the users in addition to the predefined feedback comments. Fuerst discloses the creator constructing a survey by entering the text of the questions in accordance with various question type and syntax rules

(column 6, lines 30-33). Both the Feedback Forum and Fuerst are concerned with collecting feedback from users in an on-line environment, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include determining when selections can include free-form comments from the users in addition to the predefined feedback comments in the Feedback Forum, as seen in Fuerst, thereby providing the users with a plurality of means to leave feedback, thus making the Feedback Forum more robust.

As per claim 103, the Feedback Forum discloses supplying a specific selection to a requesting user, wherein a request for the specific selection identifies at least one of a specific one of the users and a specific online payment transaction (i.e., comments left about a specific user ID in relation to the auction transaction, page 1).

As per claim 104, the Feedback Forum does not explicitly disclose deciding not to permit free-form comments when to do so would be against a policy associated with one of the users involved in a specific online payment transaction. Fuerst discloses survey results submitted by users stored in table 600 (column 5, lines 66-67), wherein unnecessary tables may be deleted (column 6, lines 12-13). Both the Feedback Forum and Fuerst are concerned with collecting feedback from users in an on-line environment, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include deciding not to permit free-form comments when to do so would be against a policy associated with one of the users involved in the Feedback Forum, as seen in Fuerst, thereby being able to

effectively control the feedback submitted by users, thus making the Feedback Forum more robust.

As per claim 105, the Feedback Forum discloses keeping with each selection a response comment from the buyer or the seller involved in the specific transaction, wherein the response comment is supplied in response to a particular selection from the predefined feedback comments (i.e., positive, neutral, and/or negative comments left by the winning high bidder and seller in an auction, page 1).

As per claim 107, the Feedback Forum discloses receiving the selections from menu options selected by the users (i.e., an indication of whether your comment is positive, neutral, or negative, via a menu selection, page 1) .

Claims 108-113 are rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejections of claims 95-101, since they are the computer-readable medium claims corresponding to the method claims.

Claims 114-118 are rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejections of claims 95-101, since they are the system claims corresponding to the method claims.

5. Claims 106 and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Feedback Forum (eBay.com, November 10, 1999, via web.archive.org), in view of Fuerst (USPN 6,189,029), in further view of Bayer et al (USPN 6,311,190).

As per claim 106, neither the Feedback Forum nor Fuerst disclose presenting the selections to requestors in target languages associated with the requestors. Bayer

et al discloses conducting surveys over the internet to multiple users in multiple countries in different languages (column 2, lines 9-12 and figure 1). Further, Bayer discloses enabling a voter or other registrant to register with system 10 in their preferred language (column 5, lines 53-58). The Feedback Forum, Fuerst and Bayer et al are concerned with surveying via the internet, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include presenting the selections to requestors in target languages associated with the requestors in the Feedback Forum, as seen in Bayer, making the Feedback Forum system more flexible and robust, by allowing the use of multiple languages.

As per claim 119, neither the Feedback Forum nor Fuerst discloses the server is to present each association in a target language of each particular user of the online transaction facility. Bayer et al discloses conducting surveys over the internet to multiple users in multiple countries in different languages (column 2, lines 9-12 and figure 1). Further, Bayer discloses enabling a voter or other registrant to register with system 10 in their preferred language (column 5, lines 53-58). The Feedback Forum, Fuerst and Bayer et al are concerned with surveying via the internet, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the server is to present each association in a target language of each particular user of the online transaction facility in the Feedback Forum, as seen in Bayer, making the Feedback Forum system more flexible and robust, by allowing the use of multiple languages.

Response to Arguments

6. In the Remarks, Applicant argues that neither the Feedback Forum nor Fuerst disclose presenting predefined feedback comments using an Internet connection to a first user in response to an online payment transaction between the first user and a second user, and that the Feedback Forum teaches away from using predefined comments by teaching that you can leave a brief comment. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Feedback Forum discloses the user leaving the comment asked whether the comment is positive, negative, or neutral, and selects one of these three (3) predefined terms (see "Leave Feedback about an eBay User"). As such, the Feedback Forum indeed discloses presenting predefined feedback comments using an Internet connection to a first user in response to an online payment transaction between the first user and a second user. In addition, although the Feedback Forum discloses leaving comments for any eBay user, that is simply one portion of the Feedback Forum. Similarly, as seen in Applicant's claim 96 and on page 19 of Applicant's specification, free-form comments may be left by a user. As a result, the Feedback Forum of eBay.com does not teach away from Applicant's invention.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (571) 272-6726. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

December 27, 2007

C S
ANDRE BOYCE
PATENT EXAMINER
A.U. 3623